

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/082,351	,351 02/26/2002		Peter Cripps	MAGN002/01US	9717	
5073	7590	05/10/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
BAKER BO	OTTS L.I	L.P.	AGHDAM, F	AGHDAM, FRESHTEH N		
2001 ROSS . SUITE 600	AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
DALLAS, T	X 7520	1-2980	2611			
				DATE MAILED: 05/10/200	DATE MAILED: 05/10/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			$\mathscr{A}^{\nu}$			
-	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<del></del>			
Advisory Action	10/082,351	CRIPPS ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Freshteh N. Aghdam	2611				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe			ress			
THE REPLY FILED 17 April 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP						
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the followlaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notation (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods:</li> </ol>	owing replies: (1) an amendment, a ptice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The repl	ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (	ence, which CFR 41.31; or			
<ul> <li>a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of</li> <li>b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the</li> </ul>	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	f the final rejection.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a nd the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))	), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.			
<ul> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</li> </ul>						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	, -	jected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).	· ——	, timely filed amendm	nent canceling			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ⊠ w vided below or appended.	ill be entered and an	explanation of			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-22</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessarily	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by see the attachment.			ince pecause:			
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)				

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 04/17/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's Argument(s): On pages 11-12, applicant argues that the claimed invention is not taught or suggested by Zhang et al (US 6,369,758) "receiving a plurality of data signals and a plurality of pilot signals on a plurality of antenna elements, each data signal from the plurality of data signals being uniquely associated with a pilot signal from the plurality of pilot signals, each pilot signal from the plurality of pilot signals having a first characteristic and a second characteristic." On page 12 applicant further argues "the training signal cited by the examiner is not a pilot signal as recited in claim 1. In fact, Zhang clearly distinguishes between a training signal and a pilot signal ... As such the two can not be equivalent."

Examiner's Response: Regarding the first argument (pages 11-12), Zhang teaches receiving a plurality of signals being received on a plurality of antenna elements may have the format as illustrated by Zhang in Fig. 2, wherein each data signal is associated with a unique pilot signal and as Zhang discloses in the description of Fig. 2, the signal format as illustrated in Fig. 2 is the preferred transmission frame format that Zhang's adaptive antenna array system works with. Even the signal according to the

instant application comprises successively transmitted frames and that is the reason why in claim 4 of the instant application disclosed a beginning and an end indicator of the data signal. Moreover, it is inherent for a smart antenna based transceiver to receive lots of signals from other transmitters; therefore, one would clearly recognize that there would be some signal that has the format of Zhang's. Regarding the second argument (page 12), Zhang teaches identifying a first pilot signal (training symbols) from the plurality of pilot signals based on the first characteristic of the first pilot signal (i.e. autocorrelation characteristics of the training symbols) and adjusting the weight value associated with each antenna element from the plurality of antenna elements so that the second characteristic of the first pilot signal (training symbols) is substantially optimized (to receive the most preferable signal) with respect to the second characteristic of the remaining pilot signals (undesired signals) from the plurality of pilot signals (Col. 1, Lines 21-37; Col. 2, Lines 19-28; Col. 3, Lines 1-18; Col. 4, Lines 61-67; Col. 5, Lines; Col. 6, Lines 41-44; Col. 15, Lines 51-55; Col. 18, Lines 1-18). Moreover, applicant fails to explain why and how the applicant's pilot signal is different from the training symbols of Zhang's in the claims. In fact, there is no description about the specifics of the applicant's pilot signal; therefore, examiner made the broadest reasonable interpretation of the pilot signal since in general a pilot signal is used for training purposes.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Freshteh N. Aghdam whose telephone number is (571)

Application/Control Number: 10/082,351 Page 4

Art Unit: 2611

272-6037. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:00-5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chieh Fan can be reached on (571) 272-3042. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Freshteh Aghdam May 1, 2006 MA MANACO KEVIN BURD PRIMARY EXAMINER